

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the Final Office Action is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action claims 10, 32 and 49, 50 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Provided below is a more detailed discussion as to how these claims are considered to be definite and in accordance with 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Reference is made to the disclosure appearing on page 13, lines 14 to 18 of the original application which reads as follows:

An embodiment of the invention features a spindle that has two axially spaced film roll mounting surfaces of different diameter, with the interior one being larger in diameter than the other mounting surface which mounting surfaces are dimensioned relative to core inserts of the film roll which core inserts are dimensioned of different sizes so as to limit mounting of the film roll in only one axial orientation.

Reference is further made to Figure 115 (either the original or the replacement sheet submitted with the last response) which illustrates a spindle having a larger diameter mounting surface which drops down to a smaller diameter mounting surface toward the cantilevered spindle's free end. There is further shown in Figure 115 a first sized core plug that is the one most (axially) inwardly positioned or the one closest to the base end of the illustrated cantilevered spindle. In Figure 115, the roll is shown in its mounted position relative to the spindle and the first sized core plug is shown to have a larger interior diameter than that of the opposite, smaller diameter core plug. As further shown in Figure 115, the smaller diameter core plug has an interior diameter that is similar to the exterior diameter of the smaller diameter spindle mounting surface but less than the exterior diameter of the larger diameter spindle mounting surface. Thus, if a user tries to insert a roll onto the spindle with the smaller core plug slid first onto the spindle free end, the smaller core plug will abut the step-up region between the smaller and larger mounting surfaces to preclude a mounting in position of the roll on the spindle. If however the operator presents the larger core plug first, the larger core and the roll can clear and slide past the step-up region between the two different sized mounting surfaces. Upon completion of roll mounting the smaller core plug is received by the smaller diameter mounting surface of the spindle for proper mounting of the roll core. Thus, for example, in an embodiment like that shown in the figures, an operator is prevented from sliding the non-toothed (or non-

drive) smaller diameter core plug all the way to the base of the spindle only to later discover that the roll needs to be turned around to have the desired drive teeth meshing arrangement achieved.

The previous specification amendments and the associated discussion presented in the last response of the Applicants (prior to the present Amendment) concerning this issue were made in reference to the revised Figure 115 submitted with the last amendment with added figure numbers to help reference components shown in that figure (some of these figure numbers that are shown in the revised Figure 115 are said not to be illustrated in the Final Office Action suggesting a review was being made of the original Figure 115 and not the current one at that time). Also, included with the Figure 115 replacement drawings in the last amendment was replacement Figure 137 illustrating one of the core plug's inner surfaces shown in position on the spindle in Figure 115.

Also, to facilitate an easier understanding of the above described and featured arrangement of the present invention, there has been further included an added paragraph on page 13 further emphasizing the above quoted disclosure on original page 13. This added disclosure is derived from the disclosure appearing on page G6 of provisional application 60/469,040 which provisional application is incorporated by reference on page 1 of the present application. Accordingly, no new matter is presented with this specification amendment. Page G10 of the noted provisional application provides additional discussion of the claimed arrangement like in claim 10.

Based on the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 and the remaining 35 U.S.C. 112 rejected claims; 32, 49 and 50, are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs.

In the Office Action, independent claim 8 and dependents 54 to 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Erny '465. This prior art rejection is respectfully traversed.

Erny '465 discloses a self-centering holder for a roll of paper that features support 11 that is "mounted, by means not shown, for rotation about a vertical axis." Erny further features hollow cylindrical support sleeve 12 which extends into bearing sleeves 34 and 36 mounted within support 11. Sleeve 12 further supports tube extension 13 which is fixed to center block 26 (provided internally and in mid region of tube 13). Extending off from center block 26 are slide

rods 48 and 50 on which is supported plunger support disk 62 and latch supporting disk 52 with spring biased latch member set 17. As shown in Figure 2, latch actuation rod 72 is secured at one end to plunger support disk 62. Knob 22 is secured to the opposite end of rod 72. When an operator pulls on knob 22, plunger support disk 62 is moved forward toward the free end of tube 13 whereupon plungers 68 abuts the latches 17 so as to depress the latches. With the latches depressed, a paper roll is free to slide off tube 13.

Claim 8, sets forth the following:

“wherein said lock in-position mechanism comprises a latch that includes a latch component which is positioned for deflecting contact with a latch reception component such that a rotation of said spindle from said film roll replacement position to said film feed to dispenser mode position automatically moves said latch into a latch state following deflection”.

Thus, in accordance with the claim arrangement of claim 8, the latch component is positioned such that rotation of said spindle automatically moves said latch component into a latch state following deflection.

It is respectfully submitted that Erny ‘465 fails to disclose in any fashion the claimed structural arrangement of claim 8 relative to the rotation of the spindle automatically moving the latch component into a latch state. In other words, the latch release mechanism in Erny ‘465 is operated by pulling on knob 22 and attached plunger disk 62 and the associated plunger rod 68 so as to slide plunger rod 68 into abutment with the latches. There is no automatic movement of a latch component into a latch state relative to a rotation of the spindle between the noted positions of claim 8. Rather, the rotation of spindle “12”, as referred to in the Office Action, about vertical axis 10 of “spindle-to-support connector” 11 has no impact or relationship with the separately operated knob, actuator rod 72 and plunger disk assembly that simply slides back and forth regardless of the “spindle” position. Accordingly, in Erny there is no latch component that is positioned for automatic movement upon rotation of the spindle between the two noted positions set out in claim 8 and withdrawal of the prior art rejection raised against claims 8, 32, 49 and 50 is respectfully requested.


Based on the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that all claims, and the application as a whole, stands in condition for allowance, and confirmation of allowance at the Examiner's earliest convenience is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, such as fees under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, please charge the fees to Deposit Account 02-4300; Order No. 034017.009.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By:



Dennis C. Rodgers, Reg. 32,936
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: 202/263-4300
Facsimile: 202/263-4329

Date: December 19, 2006